Glossary

CERCLA Terminology

Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements

Generally, any Federal, State, or local requirements or regulations that would apply to a remedial action if it were not being conducted under CERCLA, or that while not strictly applicable, are relevant in the sense that they regulate similar situations or actions and are appropriate to be followed in implementing a particular remedial action. See CERCLA 121(d)(2)(A) and 40 CFR 300.400(g). (See Submodule 1.3, Note B, and Submodule 4.1.)

Balancing criteria

Five of the nine criteria established by the NCP for evaluating alternatives in the FS prior to proposing and selecting the remedy for a site or OU. The balancing criteria are listed at CERCLA 121(d)(4), and in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(f)(1)(i)(B) or 54 FR 8850-8851. The five balancing criteria (long-term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; short-term effectiveness; implementability; and cost) are considered for all alternatives that meet the two threshold criteria (protection of human health and the environment and compliance with ARARs). (See Submodule 4.4, Note A; Submodule 5.1; and Submodule 6.1, Note B.)

Chemical-, location-, action-specific ARARs

The three categories of ARARs. Chemical- and action-specific ARARs are considered from the earliest stages of scoping an RI/FS. Action-specific ARARs are first addressed in the FS, once alternatives have been assembled. (See Submodule 1.3, Note B, and Submodule 4.1.)

Comparative analysis of alternatives

See Individual analysis of alternatives, below.

Compliance agreements

A general term that refers to several types of agreements between a Federal agency (such as DOE), EPA, and (typically) the State regarding the investigation and remediation of contamination at a particular site or installation. See CERCLA 120(e)(2).

Detailed analysis of alternatives

The final stage of a CERCLA feasibility study in which the alternatives are evaluated against seven (the two threshold and the five balancing criteria) of the nine criteria established in the NCP. The detailed analysis is divided into two parts, the individual analysis and the comparative analysis. See 40 CFR 300.430(e)(9). (See Submodule 5.2.)

Evaluation criteria

The nine evaluation criteria established in the NCP for evaluation of remedial alternatives prior to remedy selection. The nine criteria are (1) protectiveness of human health and the environment; (2) compliance with ARARs; (3) long-term effectiveness and permanence; (4) reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; (5) short-term effectiveness; (6) implementability; (7) cost; (8) State acceptance; and (9) community acceptance. See 40 CFR 300.430(e)(9)(iii). (See Submodule 5.1, Note A, and Submodule 6.1, Note B.)

General response actions

The response actions that could be taken to address the contamination problems. Examples are containment, excavation, and treatment. (See Submodule 1.3.)

Hazard Ranking System

The EPA scoring system by which sites are evaluated for inclusion on the NPL.

Innovative technology

A remedial technology that has not been demonstrated in actual field use in a sufficient number of settings or with a sufficient number of contaminants to be considered an established technology. See CERCLA 121(b)(2). (See Submodule 3.1, Note A; Submodule 4.2, Note B; and Submodule 6.2, Note D.)

Individual analysis of alternatives

The first of two stages in the detailed analysis of alternatives that is the last step in a CERCLA FS. The "defined" remedial alternatives are first evaluated separately in the *individual* analysis against seven criteria (see Threshold criteria and Balancing criteria), and are then compared by the same criteria, in the *comparative* analysis. (See Submodule 5.2, Note B.)

Interim remedial action

A remedial action that is taken at a site to address one or more of the site problems, but not all of the site problems. IRAs are based on an RI/FS and selected in a ROD, just as final remedial actions are. (See Submodule 3.2.)

Lead agency

The Federal or State agency responsible for conducting the RI/FS and preparing the Proposed Plan and ROD. For DOE facilities, DOE is usually the lead agency. See 40 CFR 300.5.

Media-specific action

An alternative in an FS that does not address all of the problems identified at a site or OU, but that is targeted at one or more related problems. (Contrast sitewide alternative, below.) MSAs are assembled into sitewide alternatives prior to the comparative analysis. (See Submodule 4.4.)

National Priorities List

A list of known contaminated sites established as priority sites for action under CERCLA. Sites are placed on the list on the basis of their HRS score. See 40 CFR 300.425(c).

Operable unit

Under CERCLA, a complex site that presents numerous contamination problems can be divided into subsets of problems for separate investigation and remediation. OUs often are based on geographical considerations, waste-type considerations, or environmental media. Any logical division or grouping of the site problems is allowed.

Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection

See Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection below.

Post-ROD changes

Changes to the selected remedy after the ROD is signed. There are three categories of post-ROD changes, requiring differing levels of documentation. See CERCLA 117(c). (See Submodule 6.3.)

Pre-ROD changes

Changes to the proposed remedy before the ROD is signed. There are three categories of pre-ROD changes, requiring differing levels of documentation in the ROD or before a ROD can be signed. (See Submodule 6.2.)

Preferred alternative

The alternative identified in the Proposed Plan as the one that the lead agency is most considering for selection. (See Submodule 6.1.)

Preliminary Assessment

An initial evaluation of a potential contaminated site to evaluate it for inclusion on the NPL. See 40 CFR 300.420(b). This is the first phase of a PA/SI. (See Submodule 1.2, Note B.)

Preliminary remediation goal

An acceptable residual contamination level or risk range that will remain after remediation. Example: "The preliminary remediation goal for the surface water is to attain AWQC for all metals at all points along Suver Ditch." PRGs are developed during Scoping and generally are based on ARARs or preliminary risk assessment calculations. See 40 CFR 300.430(e)(2)(i) (See Submodule 1.3, Note C, and Submodule 4.1.)

Process options

Specific treatment or management options or technologies that might be used as part of a remedial alternative. (See Submodule 4.2.)

QA levels (e.g., I, III)

A series of five levels of analytical quality and back-up documentation established by EPA in the DQO guidance manual. (See Submodule 1.4.) Revised EPA guidance on DQOs is to be issued soon. DOE will provide updated guidance as appropriate for use of QA levels.

Quality Assurance Program (or Project) Plan

A QA program established for a specific program or project. EPA has established a standard format and contents for QAPPs and has published guidance. Note: quality assurance project plans are sometimes distinguished from program plans by the acronym QAPjP. (See Submodule 1.5.)

Remedial Action

A phase of the CERCLA process in which the remedy as designed for RD is implemented.

Remedial Design

A phase of the CERCLA process in which the remedy selected in the ROD is designed for implementation.

Remedial action alternatives

Combinations of specific actions that could be taken at a site or OU to remediate or alleviate the contamination problems. Remedial alternatives are developed and evaluated in the FS. (See Submodule 4.3, Notes B, C, and D.)

Remedial action objective

An objective established for a CERCLA FS. RAOs are first established on a preliminary basis during Scoping. (See Submodule 1.3, Note C, and Submodule 4.1, Note C.)

Removal

A site remediation of limited cost and duration that is conducted under the authority in CERCLA Section 104.

Site Inspection

A limited site investigation, possibly involving taking a few samples. Performed in conjunction with a preliminary assessment prior to listing a site on the NPL. See 40 CFR 300.420(c).

Sitewide alternative

A remedial alternative in an FS that combines remedial actions for all of the problems at a site or OU and thus addresses the entire site or OU. (Contrast media-specific action.)

To be considered

A criterion, advisory, guidance, or proposed standard that, while not legally binding and not a potential ARAR, is evaluated along with ARARs in setting protective cleanup targets. See 40 CFR 300.400(g)(3).

Treatment

A chemical or physical process that changes either the chemical or physical properties of a waste or contaminated medium. CERCLA establishes a preference for remedial actions that includes treatment. See CERCLA preference for use of treatment (as a principal component of a selected remedy) above. (See Module 3.)

CERCLA Requirements

Administrative Record

An official file of reports and other documents maintained by the lead agency regarding the Scoping, RI, FS, and Proposed Plan phases of the CERCLA process and that supports the remedial decisions reached and documented in the ROD. Established at CERCLA 113(k)(1). See 40 CFR 300.800 et seq. (See Submodule 1.1 and Submodule 6.1, Note D.)

ARARs determination

A decision by one of the regulatory agencies (most often the U.S. EPA and/or the State environmental agency) that a particular requirement is or is not applicable or relevant and appropriate to follow (i.e., is an ARAR) for remedial action(s) at a site or OU.

ARARs waivers

A declaration that an ARAR will not be applied to a remedial action or will not be attained by a planned remedial action for one or more of the five reasons listed in the NCP at 40 CFR 300.430(f)(1)(ii)(C) or 53 FR 51438-51440, and at CERCLA 121(d)(4). (See Submodule 3.1, Note B, and Submodule 6.2, Note B.)

ARARs compliance

Meeting the ARARs. ARARs compliance is one of the threshold requirements that an alternative must meet (unless an ARAR is waived; see ARARs waivers) to be selected as the remedy for a site or OU. See 40 CFR 300.430(f)(1)(ii)(B). (See Submodule 3.1, Note B, and Submodule 6.2, Note B.)

CERCLA expectations

A list of six expectations that EPA considers in developing appropriate remedial alternatives (derived in part from the CERCLA statute): (1) use of treatment to address principal threats; (2) use of engineering controls, such as containment, for low-threat wastes or where treatment is impractical; (3) use of a combination of methods, as appropriate, to achieve protection of human health and the environment; (4) use of institutional controls, as appropriate, to limit exposure; (5) use of innovative technologies when they offer advantages; and (6) returning usable groundwaters to their beneficial uses. See 40 CFR 300.430(a)(iii).

CERCLA preference for use of treatment (as a principal component of a selected remedy)

CERCLA: "121((b) General Rules.–(1) Remedial actions in which treatment which permanently and significantly reduces the volume, toxicity, or mobility of the hazardous substances, pollutants,

and contaminants is a principal element, are to be preferred over remedial actions which do not involve such treatment." See also See 40 CFR 300.430(a)(iii).

Declaration

The first element of the standard ROD format. The declaration identifies the site or OU, the lead and support agencies, and the remedial decision being made. (See Submodule 6.2, Note B.)

Decision Summary

The second element of the standard ROD format. The Decision Summary outlines the basis for the remedial decision (remedy selection) being made for a CERCLA site. (See Submodule 6.2, Note B.)

EPA/State concurrence

With DOE as the lead agency, both EPA and State concurrence are required in remedy selection. Generally, both EPA and the State will sign RODs. The ROD is required by the NCP to address EPA and State concurrence in the remedy selection. See CERCLA 120(f) and 121(f) and 40 CFR 300.430(f)(1)(i)(C). (See Submodule 6.2.)

Explanation of Significant Differences

A document required when the remedy, as implemented, differs significantly from the remedy as selected in the ROD. See CERCLA 117 (c) and 40 CFR 300.435(c)(2). (See Submodule 6.3, Note B.)

Five-year review

CERCLA 121(c) requires a review every five years or less of the protectiveness provided by any selected remedial action that leaves hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants at a site.

No-action alternative

CERCLA requires consideration of a no-action alternative for each CERCLA site. No-action is often deemed to include very limited action alternatives that would maintain existing containments or access restrictions, such as fencing. See 40 CFR 300.430(e)(6).

Permanence

An element considered in evaluating a remedial alternative for long-term effectiveness. Permanence is listed in SARA 121 as one of the CERCLA preferences. Permanence is generally considered to be best provided by a treatment alternative that destroys a waste or so alters its composition that it is rendered permanently nonhazardous. (See Submodule 5.2, Note A.)

Proposed Plan

A plan developed and published by the lead agency that summarizes the results of the FS and presents the preferred alternative for public consideration prior to remedy selection. See CERCLA 117(a) and 40 CFR 300.430(f)(1)(ii). (See Submodule 6.1.)

Protectiveness, cost-effectiveness, permanence

The three CERCLA preferences for selected remedial actions established in CERCLA 121(b)(1).

Responsiveness summary

One of the three sections in the standard format for a ROD. The Responsiveness Summary outlines the comments received on the FS and the Proposed Plan and the lead agency's responses to the comments. See CERCLA 117(b) and 40 CFR 300.430(f)(3)(F). (See Submodule 6.2, Note C.)

Record of decision

The formal document in which the lead agency sets forth the selected remedy and the reasons for its selection. See 40 CFR 300.430(f)(5). (See Submodule 6.2.)

Threshold criteria

The two criteria that any alternative must meet in order to be considered for selection as a site or OU remedy: (1) overall protectiveness of human health and the environment and (2) compliance with ARARs. (See Submodule 5.3, Note A.)

Data

Data gaps

Unavailable data that would be needed or useful in facilitating a complete understanding of the nature and extent of contamination at a site or OU, to construct a complete conceptual model of the site or OU, to complete a baseline risk assessment, and to select and implement a remedy. Not all data gaps are identified as data needs. (See Submodule 1.4.)

Data needs

Unavailable data that are determined to be essential in completing the RI/FS, remedy selection, and/or RD/RA at a site or OU. (See Submodule 1.4.)

Data qualifiers (e.g., J, R)

Indicators of data quality or reliability attached to data points as conclusions of the data evaluation process. For example, the data qualifier "R" indicates that, based on a review of the analytical process, the data point is not usable and should be rejected. (See Submodule 2.2.)

Data validation

A process in which analytical data and its back-up documentation are evaluated to determine the acceptability of the data provided by the analytical laboratory. Procedures for evaluation of chemical data have been developed in EPA's Contract Laboratory Program. Data evaluation procedures for radiological data have not been standardized. (See Submodule 2.2.)

Outliers

Data points in a data set that are not representative of the set as a whole. Outliers generally are considered to be unreliable or bad data. (See Submodule 2.2.)

Precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness, and comparability

Five measures of data quality that are determined during data validation. (See Submodule 8.1.2.)

Risk Assessment

Baseline Risk Assessment

A formal risk assessment conducted as part of the RI according to EPA-prescribed procedures. The need for remedial action at a site is established in part on the results of the baseline risk assessment. (See Submodule 2.4 and Submodule 2.5.)

Contaminants of Concern

See Submodule 1.3, Note C, and Submodule 2.4, Notes A and B.

Exposure pathway

A series of hypothetical events and agencies by which a contaminant can migrate to and be taken up by a human or environmental receptor. A pathway is not complete unless all of the following elements are present: (1) source of contamination, (2) release mechanism, (3) transport medium,

(4) exposure point, and (5) route of exposure (or uptake). In general, remedial actions seek to eliminate one or more of these elements from each complete pathway. (See Submodule 1.3, Note C, and Submodule 2.4, Notes A and B.)

Exposure assessment

The first step in the baseline risk assessment in which the exposure pathways are identified and the probable exposure levels are calculated for various environmental receptors, including human beings. Together with the toxicity assessment, it forms the basis for calculations of risk in the risk characterization. (See Submodule 2.4, Notes A and B.)

Fate and transport mechanisms

The general areas of interest in the movement of chemicals through the environment to their ultimate disposition: decomposition, bioaccumulation, dispersion, or deposition on or in a particular medium.

Hazard index

In the baseline risk assessment, the ration of the dose calculated for a receptor divided by the reference dose. When the HI exceeds 1.0 (i.e., the expected dose exceeds EPA's reference dose), a health risk is assumed to exist. (See Submodule 2.4.)

Hazard quotient

The ratio of exposure to toxicity for non-cancer endpoints. The HQ is calculated by dividing the estimated daily intake of a chemical by the non-cancer reference dose for that chemical. When the HQ exceeds 1.0, a possible health risk is assumed to exist.

Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables

Published by EPA, HEAST is a repository of reference doses, reference concentrations, and cancer slope factors for use in baseline risk assessments. The values in HEAST have not been subjected to EPA-wide review and consensus, but have the consensus of at least one EPA office. See IRIS.

Integrated Risk Information System

An EPA database that contains reference doses, reference concentrations, and cancer slope factors for use in baseline risk assessments. The values in IRIS have been subjected to EPA-wide review and are recognized as high-quality, agency-wide consensus information. See HEAST.

Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund

EPA's primary guidance on conducting risk assessments for CERCLA sites. RAGS is composed of four parts: Volume I, Part A Human Health Evaluation Manual; Volume I, Part B Development of Risk-Based Preliminary Remediation Goals; Volume I, Part C Risk Evaluation of Remedial Alternatives; and Volume II Environmental Evaluation Manual, Interim Final.

Receptors

In risk assessment, an organism exposed to a contaminant, generally after transport through an environmental medium. See Exposure pathway.

Reference dose

An estimate of daily exposure for humans (including sensitive subpopulations) that is likely to be without adverse effects. Chronic RfDs are specifically developed to be protective for long-term exposure to a compound.

Risk characterization

The final phase of a risk assessment. It is preceded by the exposure assessment and the toxicity assessment. (See Submodule 2.4, Notes A and B.)

Risk assessment

Under CERCLA, a formal procedure by which quantitative risks for humans are calculated for a series of potential future exposure scenarios. Sometimes used to refer to the baseline risk assessment. (See Submodule 1.3 and Submodule 2.4.)

Reasonable maximum exposure

One of two exposure assumptions for which risks are calculated in the baseline risk assessment. The other is the average or typical exposure case. (See Submodule 2.4, Notes A and C.)

Slope factors

In quantitative risk assessment, risk coefficients used to calculate a carcinogenic risk from an assumed dose. EPA develops slope factors and publishes them in HEAST and IRIS. (See Submodule 2.4, Note A.)

Toxicity assessment

The second of three phases of risk assessment in which the toxicity of each of the contaminants of concern is addressed. It follows the exposure assessment and is followed by the risk characterization. (See Submodule 2.4, Note A.)

SAFER Concepts

Conceptual model (also Conceptual site model or Site conceptual model)

A SAFER tool. A combination of text, source-pathway-receptor diagrams, and conceptual diagrams that together provide a qualitative understanding of how a site works. (See Submodule 1.2; Submodule 1.2, Note C; and Module 7.)

Contingency plan

A SAFER tool. A plan of action in case a potential deviation from the expected site conditions is encountered during remediation. A contingency plan is the primary means by which an uncertainty is managed. (See Submodule 5.1, Notes B and C; and Module 7.)

Decision rules

A SAFER tool. Decision rules establish the relationship between data to be collected and the use(s) the data will be put to. Decision rules generally are "If..., then..." statements that establish what decisions or actions will be taken depending on how the data turn out once collected. Development of decision rules forces a focus on the real need for a particular type of data and tends to reduce the data collection to an essential minimum. (See Submodule 1.4, Note B, and Module 7.)

Data quality objectives

A tool to determine the type, quantity, and quality of data needed to make defensible decisions during the CERCLA process for a site or operable unit. EPA established the data quality objectives process, and guidance is available. Revised EPA guidance on DQOs is to be issued soon. DOE will provide updates as appropriate. The DQO process is incorporated in SAFER. (See Submodule 1.4, Submodule 2.2, Submodule 2.3, Submodule 3.1, and Module 7.)

Manageable uncertainty

A SAFER concept. An uncertainty is manageable, and need not be resolved through data collection, if the potential deviations from expected conditions during remediation that it involves can be handled in the field through implementation of a contingency plan. (See Submodule 1.4; Submodule 5.1, Notes A and B; Module 7; and Submodule 8.2.1.)

Monitoring plan

A SAFER tool. During remediation, the site is monitored to detect any of the reasonable (potential) deviations identified in the RI/FS. The monitoring plan is developed in concept during the FS and in detail during the RD phase. (See Submodule 5.1, Note C; Module 7; and Submodule 8.2.2.)

Observational approach

An engineering approach to investigating and cleaning up contaminated sites in which uncertainties about actual site conditions are resolved only to the extent necessary to select a remedial approach and begin remediation. Adapted from the observational method in geotechnical engineering, the observational approach is incorporated in SAFER. (See Module 7.)

Probable condition

A SAFER concept. Any physical, chemical, or regulatory condition (e.g., direction of groundwater flow, concentration of a contaminant in the river) assumed for a site and that materially affects the protectiveness; ARARs compliance; effectiveness and permanence; ability to reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume of a waste; implementability; cost; or acceptability of a remedial alternative. The probable conditions are those on which the remedy is developed, selected, and designed; they are the conditions expected to be met in the field. (See Module 1; Submodule 5.1, Notes B and C; and Module 7.)

Reasonable deviations

A SAFER concept. A deviation from the probable (expected) site conditions that has been judged sufficiently likely to be encountered that a contingency plan should be developed for it. (See Submodule 5.1, Notes B and C; and Module 7.)

Streamlined Approach For Environmental Restoration

A complete streamlining methodology developed by DOE to speed remediation at DOE sites. It includes the elements of the DQO process and the observational approach and is tailored to the special challenges that DOE encounters at its sites. (See Module 7.)

Streamlining

Any efforts to decrease the time and cost required to reach a remedial decision and complete restoration.

Uncertainty

Questions or gaps in knowledge that affect the ability to remediate the site. Uncertainty that does not impact remediation of the site is not of interest to SAFER. SAFER attributes uncertainty to measurement system limitations in accurately collecting, analyzing, and evaluating environmental data; incomplete knowledge of site conditions; inability to predict remedial technology performance; and changing or unclear regulatory requirements.

Site Investigations

Contract Laboratory Program (EPA)

A program of laboratories under contract to EPA to provide analytical services for CERCLA site investigations. The analyses are performed to EPA-prescribed procedures and levels of analytical quality assurance and quality control. (See Submodule 2.2.)

Field Sampling Plan

Together with the QAPP, the FSP makes up the Sampling and Analysis Plan in a CERCLA RI/FS Work Plan. (See Submodule 1.4 and Submodule 1.5, Note B.)

Health and Safety Plan

A required part of a CERCLA RI/FS Work Plan. (See Submodule 1.5, Note D.)

Investigation-derived waste

Refers to wastes generated during the investigation phase. Examples are purge water from wells and used personal protective equipment. Management and disposal issues for IDW can be significant. (See Submodule 2.1.)

Limited field investigation

A short duration field sampling and measurement effort targeted to answer a limited range of specific questions. May be conducted at any point in the RI/FS process, including the Scoping phase. Will frequently be used at DOE sites to support early actions. (See Submodule 1.3.)

Sampling and Analysis Plan

Part of the RI/FS Work Plan. It includes the Field Sampling Plan and the QAPP for an RI or LFI. (See Submodule 1.5.)

Stakeholders

Decisionmakers

The stakeholders who have decisionmaking signature authority for the ROD. Typically, the extended project team (see below). This may vary according to facility-specific Federal compliance agreements.

DOE project manager

A DOE field office person responsible for managing a project. As used in this manual, the DOE project manager generally would be responsible for particular environmental restoration projects at a DOE facility.

Extended project team

The individuals (internal and external) who will interact throughout the RI/FS project and who are responsible for directing, managing, conducting, and approving an RI/FS at a DOE facility. As used in this guidance, the extended project team is composed of the DOE project team, EPA and State regulatory staff, and public interest groups with decisionmaking authority.

Stakeholders

Any person or group interested in or affected by an RI/FS project conducted at a DOE facility.

Statutes and Regulations

Ambient Water Quality Criteria

Promulgated under the Clean Water Act.

Clean Air Act

PL 90-148, 42 USC 7401, et seq.

Corrective Action Management Unit

A remediation concept in the RCRA regulations in which contaminated soil or waste taken from a disposal unit during remediation can be treated and returned to the unit without meeting RCRA treatment and disposal requirements such as the Land Disposal Restrictions. The CAMU regulations are at 40 CFR 264.552. (See Submodule 3.1.)

Clean Water Act

PL 92-500, 33 USC 1251, et seq.

Environmental Assessment

An evaluation under NEPA of a proposed project or action that focuses on the probable environmental impacts of the project or action to determine whether or not an EIS will be required. If an EIS is not required, the EA results in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Environmental Impact Statement

A detailed statement required for every Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. An EIS is prepared according to the requirements in 40 CFR 6.200, et seq.

Finding of No Significant Impact

A determination made under NEPA, after completion of an environmental assessment, that an anticipated action will have no significant impact. Thus, an EIS is not required.

Land disposal restrictions

A series of restrictions and regulations that derives from the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments to RCRA that prohibit disposal of wastes in land unit (landfills, lagoons, etc.) without prior treatment to establish levels or using established technologies.

Maximum contaminant level

Set under the Safe Drinking Water Act, a level that may not be exceeded in a drinking water source.

National Environmental Policy Act

PL 91-190, 42 USC 4321, et seq.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

Regulations promulgated under the Clean Water Act that limit and require permits for point discharges of pollutants to the waters of the United States.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Successor agency to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

PL 94-580, 42 USC 6901, et seq. EPA's RCRA program includes a Corrective Action process for contaminated sites that is analogous to the CERCLA remediation process.

RCRA hazardous waste

A waste identifiable as a defined hazardous waste under the RCRA regulations at 40 CFR 261.

Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (October 17, 1986)

The latest reauthorization and amendments to CERCLA.

Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure

A waste testing procedure promulgated under RCRA at 40 CFR 261.24. A waste that is the TCLP is defined as a hazardous waste and subject to RCRA Title C.

Treatment, storage, or disposal facility

RCRA permits are required for units or facilities in which hazardous wastes are treated, stored more than 90 days, or disposed.